

**E-Waste Futures Project
Stakeholder Workshop June 20, 2017
Potential Evaluation Criteria for Adding New Products**

CalRecycle seeks stakeholder input on potential criteria for evaluating which products, if any, should be added to the definition of a covered electronic device. Small groups will be formed to discuss the ideas listed below. Please review the list and add, subtract or modify as appropriate. Also, discuss the relative importance of the criteria and explain the rationale behind the weighting.

<p>1. Current Management: How is the product currently managed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is there an existing collection and processing system (including voluntary manufacturer initiatives or retail take-back)? If so, does that system sufficiently address the fundamental goals of California's e-waste management program? b. Are free and convenient collection opportunities available to consumers throughout the state and throughout the year? c. Are the materials managed in an environmentally sound manner? d. Is reuse encouraged? e. Is the product difficult to collect and recycle due to weight, bulk or other factors?
<p>2. Characteristics: Does the product contain toxic materials; does it fail hazardous waste tests?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is it currently listed in DTSC regulations? b. Does it pose a hazard to human or environmental health?
<p>3. Prevalence: How prevalent is the product in the waste stream and/or in the HHW collection system? <i>(See notes below from Form 303 data and the Waste Characterization Study.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is there a problem with illegal dumping? b. Regardless of the percentage of the product in the waste stream, what is the impact associated with disposal of the product?
<p>4. Trends: What are the projected usage trends (increasing/decreasing; will the issue be going away in the future)?</p>
<p>5. Commodity Value: What is the intrinsic value of the discarded product?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is it economically feasible to sell the product or its components for reuse? b. Is there value in recovering materials contained in the product before processing the device? (For example, can resources such as precious metals be removed before treating, crushing, shredding?)
<p>6. Stewardship:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Do local governments bear the cost of collection and processing? b. Can the manufacturers can be easily identified? (For notification under the current fee and payment system; or for assignment of responsibility in a product stewardship model.)

Notes regarding Waste Stream Prevalence

- Form 303 data – All local government Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) programs are required to report annually on the amount and disposition of HHW collected and recycled through their

Attachment 1

programs. Form 303 specifies separate reporting of “CEDs” and “Other UWEDs” collection. Trends indicate that the quantity (in pounds) of e-waste collected by local government continues to increase, and at about 40%, is still the largest waste stream collected in HHW programs. This is likely at least partially due to improved outreach by CalRecycle staff regarding the requirement that local program managers report all e-waste collected either directly or through a designated approved collector operating on behalf of the local agency.

- CalRecycle’s Waste Characterization Study published in 2015 found e-waste overall is 0.9% (approximately 273,878 tons) of the total waste stream disposed of in solid waste facilities. E-waste in this study includes four specifically defined categories (See Attachment 2 for definitions): brown goods 0.3%; computer-related electronics 0.1%; small consumer electronics 0.2%; video display devices 0.2% (does not add up to 0.9% due to rounding).